



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/091,204

03/05/2002

Herbert T. Ong

5681-10600

6378

7590

06/06/2006

Robert C. Kowert
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,204

Applicant(s)

ONG ET AL.

Examiner

Hai V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on 18 May 2006.
2. Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.
3. The co-pending applications are 10/091,203 and 10/090,893.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

5. The textual portion of the specification is replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors too numerous to mention specifically. The specification should be revised carefully.
6. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks TM, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for "the" and "said" within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to because in the drawings 7, 8, there is Conveter 114 instead of Converter 114. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2142

9. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Mansour et al. 2002/0111995 A1** in view of **Dutta et al. US patent # 6,615,212 B1**.

10. As to claim 1, Mansour discloses a system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server format(s) each supported by one or more application(s) of the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more device(s) via a network (*Internet*);

a small device (*PDA device*) configured to couple to the server;

However, Mansour does not explicitly disclose plugging a converter module into a framework configured to accept one module.

In the same field of endeavor, Dutta discloses the transcoding proxy server including a transcoding framework having transform plugin (*Fig. 6*) or transcoder plugin (*Fig. 7*).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Dutta's teachings of the transcoding framework configured to accept a transform plugin or transcoder plugin (*Dutta, Figures 5, 6*) with the teachings of Mansour, for the *purpose of making the display of the application data much more appropriate for the client device (Mansour, paragraph [0022] or minimizing transmission times (Dutta, col. 2, lines 26-36)*.

Mansour-Dutta discloses the converter module (*Dutta, the transcoder plugin*) is configured to generate a document in a small device format (*Dutta, client formats or PDF or HTML documents*) from one of the documents in one of the one server format(s)

Art Unit: 2142

(Dutta, postscript documents) (Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26); and

Mansour-Dutta discloses providing the document in the small device format to the small device *(Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26)*.

11. As to claim 2, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server formats include office document formats *(Mansour, server versions [0118]; Dutta, postscript documents)*.

12. As to claim 3, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, to generate a document in one of the one or more small device formats, the converter module is further configured to exclude one or more format features of the document in the server format from the document in the small device format *(Mansour, the UI server are configured to process and manipulate to perform different UI form for the client device, [0217]; suitable configured, [0053]-[0218]; Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26)*.

13. As to claim 4, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the converter module is further is configured to receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device *(Mansour, modified version, server versions [0118]); and*

generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format *(Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]; Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26)*.

14. As to claim 5, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the

Art Unit: 2142

small device format, the converter module is further configured to restore one or more format features of the document in the server format excluded from the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]; *Dutta*, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26).

15. As to claim 6, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and wherein the merger module is configured to merge the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

16. As to claim 7, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, and wherein the differencing module is configured to: determine differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and

provide the determined differences to the merger module, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

17. As to claim 8, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

Art Unit: 2142

18. As to claim 9, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour, merge email, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); plug a differencing module into the framework (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); generate a version of the document in an interim format from the document in the server format (*Mansour, server versions, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); wherein the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the interim format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the interim format and the version of the document in the interim format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, difference form, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*); wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format with the version of the document in the interim format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, converted and emerged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

Art Unit: 2142

19. As to claim 10, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

20. As to claim 11, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: unplug the converter module from the framework; plug a different converter module into the framework (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

21. As to claim 12, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the different converter module is configured to: generate documents in a different one of the one or more small device formats from documents in a different one of the one or more server formats; and generate modified versions of documents in the different server format from modified versions of documents in the different small device format (*Mansour, converted, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

22. As to claim 13, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework, wherein the merger module is configured to merge modified versions of documents in the server format with corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format to generate synchronized versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, merged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

23. As to claim 14, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, wherein the differencing module is

Art Unit: 2142

configured to determine differences between modified versions of documents in the server format and corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

24. As to claim 15, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server comprises a converter factory configured to generate the converter module, the merger module and the differencing module for plugging into the framework (*Mansour, converted, merged, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

25. Claim 16 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

26. Claims 17-24 are similar limitations of claims 3-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 3-10.

27. Claim 25 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

28. Claims 26-28 are similar limitations of claims 13-15; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 13-15.

29. Claim 29 is corresponding method claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

30. Claim 30 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

31. Claims 31-32 are similar limitations of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 6-7.

Art Unit: 2142

32. Claims 33-34 are similar limitations of claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9-10.

33. Claim 35 is similar limitations of claims 9, 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9, 7.

34. Claim 36 is similar limitation of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 10.

35. Claims 37-38 are similar limitations of claims 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12-13.

36. Claim 39 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

37. Claim 40 is similar limitations of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9.

38. Claim 41 is similar limitations of claim 13; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 13.

39. Claim 42 is corresponding article of manufacture claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

40. Claim 43 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

41. Claim 44 is similar limitations of claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 7.

42. Claim 45 is similar limitations of claims 9, 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9, 10.

Art Unit: 2142

43. Claim 46 is similar limitations of claims 12, 11; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 10, 11.

44. Claims 47, 48 are similar limitations of claims 12, 13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12, 13.

45. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

Conclusion

46. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 23 January 2006 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3901. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hai V. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2142



THONG VU
P.E.

